

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
OF
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD**

MARCH 17, 2004

The Greensboro Planning Board met in Regular Session on Wednesday, March 17, 2004 at 2:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Melvin Municipal Office Building, Greensboro, North Carolina. Board Members present were Chair Patrick Downs, J.P. McIntyre, John Rhodes, Alan Pike, Richard Hall, Julius Koonce, Stephen Marks and Mike Fox. Staff members present were Robert Morgan, Acting Planning Director, Alec MacIntosh, and Steve Galanti of the Planning Department; and Craig McKinney, Transportation Planner, Greensboro Department of Transportation (GDOT).

Chair Downs called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 18, 2004 REGULAR MEETING.

Mr. Pike moved approval of the minutes of the February 18, 2004 regular meeting as written, seconded by Mr. Rhodes. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Rhodes, Hall, Koonce, Pike, Marks, Fox. Nays: None.)

REQUEST FOR MINOR MODIFICATION OF CONDITIONAL DISTRICT ZONING CONDITION CALLING FOR 50-FOOT BUFFER ALONG WESTERN PROPERTY LINE AT FRIENDLY ACRES TOWNHOMES – 1801 BRASSFIELD ROAD – FOR STARMOUNT COMPANY. (APPROVED)

Mr. Galanti said the 1986 Conditional District Zoning for this site includes the following condition requiring a buffer along the western boundary:

- “5) Tract D is to be used for any purpose permitted in Residential 120 District, provided that, if other than single family detached is developed adjoining Lakeview Hills... then a fifty (50) foot buffer zone along the west line adjoining Lakeview Hills Subdivision... will be provided.”

He said Starmount Residential has submitted a preliminary subdivision plat and watershed development plan for the review and approval of the Technical Review Committee. The subdivision plat depicts construction of single-family attached units, for sale. Several of those units were constructed such that they are now encroaching less than two feet into the required 50-foot buffer. Section 30- 9-11.6 (Minor Modifications of Conditions in Conditional Zoning Districts or Special Use Permits) of the Development Ordinance states that:

"Recognizing that the evaluation of requests for minor modifications of conditions in Conditional Zoning Districts and Special Use Permits involves both technical evaluations and evaluations made in light of policies underlying the conditions, the City Council hereby designates the Planning Board to be the appropriate planning agency to approve such minor modifications, after receipt of a report from the Technical Review Committee."

The Development Ordinance further provides three possible grounds for approval of a modification to a zoning condition:

Equal or Better Performance: A finding that equal or better performance in furtherance of the purpose of the zoning condition will result from the alternate standards portrayed on the plan.

Physical Constraints: A finding that the size, topography, or existing development of the property or of the adjoining areas prevents conformance with a standard.

Other Constraints: A finding that a federal, state, or local law or regulation prevents conformance.

After reviewing the request on March 16, 2004, the Technical Review Committee feels that the tree save area and the proposed 30-foot Type "B" Planting Yard with additional plantings as depicted will provide a buffer along the western boundary of this site that will perform either equal to or better than the intent of the zoning condition.

In response to a question from Chair Downs, Mr. Galanti said the buffer wasn't even a "leave it alone" buffer; it was just a 50-foot space. If it were grass then, that would have been fine. They will replace any vegetation removed, if not more.

Mr. Hall asked if all the surrounding property owners been notified?

Mr. MacIntosh said it was not a public hearing item. Staff did not notify the surrounding owners of this particular request. In the past when it has appeared that there would definitely be more impact on the surrounding owner, staff had chosen to notify. However, in this case staff felt that, given it was a very weak condition to start with, merely requiring a certain width with no required planting therein, they felt that it was pretty evident that the impact on the adjacent properties from the plan as proposed would be decidedly less than if they had simply followed the formula as written in the zoning condition.

Mr. Hall said that now, the applicant has already encroached into the area, so this Board is really retroactively correcting not a prospective wish to encroach but a foregone set of circumstances.

Mr. MacIntosh said yes, there was a certain amount of requesting forgiveness instead of permission here. Nevertheless the test is does it result in equal or better performance compared to simply satisfying the condition as written. Staff felt that it definitely would provide more protection to the owners next door as now proposed.

Mr. Hall asked for a better description of how it is going to be better performance. He saw the drawing, but the drawing did not tell him how there is better performance here.

Mr. Galanti said that the tree save area, the Type B buffer that they are proposing and the additional plant material shown in the narrowed portions of the buffer on the exhibit before you led TRC to conclude that the buffer as shown will actually perform better.

Mr. Hall said that based on that now being in the record, he was now comfortable.

Mr. Pike moved approval of the minor modification, seconded by Mr. Marks. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Hall, Rhodes, Pike, Koonce, Fox, Marks. Nays: None.)

CITY-INITIATED ANNEXATIONS:

Mr. MacIntosh said staff has a total of 12 City-Initiated annexations to bring before the Board today.

He said that the NC General Statutes permit cities and towns to annex areas contiguous to the city limits if those areas are "developed for urban purposes." This is defined as being an area that meets one or more of five separate sets of standards. The simplest standard is 2.3 persons per acre; a second standard requires 1 person per acre and has two substandards, as it were, having to do with lot sizes; a third set of standards requires that at least 60 percent of the lots be developed with urban type uses, and there are some complicated acreage substandards in that standard as well; the fourth standard covers the entire area of a county water and sewer district, the fifth standard covers areas consisting entirely of lots that are used for commercial, industrial, governmental or institutional purposes.

In addition to areas developed for urban purposes, the state law also allows you to include areas that are defined as "necessary land connections." That can be by virtue of having one of two characteristics: first, it could be an area that lies between the city limits and an area developed for urban purposes such that the city has to run water and/or sewer lines through that area to get out to the developed area; or it can simply be an area that is bounded partly by the present city limits and partly by an area that is developed for urban purposes such that at least 60 percent of the boundary of that intervening area is formed by a combination of the city limits and the boundary of an area or areas developed for urban purposes. Filling in the gaps is what is really going on with that necessary land connection section.

Each of the 12 areas complies with those standards. In some cases, they comply in their entirety with the "developed for urban purposes" requirements. In other cases, they have one subarea meeting a certain developed for urban purposes standard and other subareas meeting other developed for urban purposes standards. In still other cases we have one or more developed for urban purposes subareas together with one or more necessary land connections.

**A. AREA 2004-1 AT 2041 WILLOW ROAD – 4.80 ACRES, 116 PEOPLE.
(RECOMMENDED)**

Mr. MacIntosh said this was the Guilford Health Care Center on the east side of Willow Road. To serve Area 2004-1, the water and sewer are already there. It would be served in the same manner as areas that have already been annexed around it, and that will likewise be true with Area 2004-2.

**B. AREA 2004-2 ON NORTH AND SOUTH SIDES OF ALAMANCE CHURCH ROAD,
EAST AND WEST OF WILLOW ROAD – 133.22 ACRES, 209 PEOPLE.
(RECOMMENDED)**

Mr. MacIntosh pointed out that the second area includes the not-yet-annexed portions of Zornbrook Valley and Wilpar Estates Subdivisions. The easternmost piece of property is the Neese Country

Sausage manufacturing facility on Alamance Church Road. The shaded areas that were previous satellite annexations. These have been annexed pursuant to utility agreement and annexation petitions.

With these two annexations, as with each of the annexations, the City is planning on setting up a contract with the rural fire district that now serves that area. State law specifically says that you may contract with a rural fire district as your means of providing fire response. Of course, the City will also send engines from its stations as well. In some cases, the rural fire district station will dispatch its engines and they will arrive sooner. In other cases, they will arrive sooner from a City station.

He pointed out Sharpe Road and said the boundary here was set by including the last lots to which sewer could certainly be extended. The City does not have water and sewer lines in Sharpe Road now but the City has them pretty much on every single street in that annexation with that exception. There is a special provision in the state law that anyone who owns an occupied house or occupied business in an area being annexed by city initiative can file a special petition up to 5 days after the public hearing. If they do so, then the City is required to add into its services report plans to extend water and sewer to that particularly property, normally to the street out in front of it, within 2 years after annexation. So you could have a minor addition of additional required facilities in any of these annexations pursuant to the City receiving those special petitions. However, staff does not know yet where the City will or will not receive those petitions from. If the City receives petitions, the City Council will approve amendments to the relevant services reports to map the required lines and to make financial arrangements to extend those lines.

He said that, at this meeting as at last month's meeting, he had copies of all the individual services reports for any Board member who wished them. Several Board members indicated they wished a set and they were so distributed.

In response to a question from Chair Downs, Mr. MacIntosh said that the homeowners were given notice of the right to request extension of utility services. He said that was in the letter that went out to the homeowners.

In response to a question from Mr. Rhodes, Mr. MacIntosh said that Wilpar Estates started out in the 1970s with its first (eastern) phase on wells and septic tanks. In the 1980s, a second phase was done on City water and sewer. Then water and sewer lines were also laid back in the first phase. In 1997, City Council changed the policy so that if you were outside the city limits and you wanted City water and/or sewer, you have to file a utility agreement and annexation petition. From then on, owners in Wilpar Estates who wanted to build on vacant lots using City water and sewer, or to hook up existing houses, filed the utility agreement and annexation petitions and the City processed those forward to annex those properties.

In response to a question from Chair Downs about costs versus revenues for the 12 annexations as a group, Mr. MacIntosh said these annexations in the long term would not yield a net loss to the City; however, in initial expenses, there would be a loss to the City. He added that when the City is doing city-initiated annexations, money making is not the primary motive. Promoting orderly development and controlling of the development and fixing problems and looking to the areas to expand in the future, all of those are taken into consideration. You always have to keep the bottom line in mind, but that is not the primary motivation for annexations.

In response to a question from Mr. Hall, Mr. MacIntosh said that on annexations you could recommend several with one motion as opposed to having to do individual motions on each one. Board actions on all of these annexations will be recommendations on to the City Council. The Council on the other hand, in enacting ordinances on each of these, must vote individually on each area.

C. AREA 2004-3 ON EAST SIDE OF PENRY ROAD, NORTH OF E. WENDOVER AVENUE – 111.87 ACRES, 0 PEOPLE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said Area 3 includes the K-Mart Distribution Center east of Penry Road together with back portions of a few other lots. He also pointed out the K-Mart Distribution Center truck parking lot, which has already been annexed. This area with the distribution center is developed for urban purposes, and he pointed out an area that was almost entirely vacant and said this is one of those necessary land connections he was talking about earlier.

D. AREA 2004-4 NORTH OF LEES CHAPEL ROAD AND WEST OF YANCEYVILLE STREET – 58.42 ACRES, 709 PEOPLE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said that Area 4 contains the Northwinds Apartments and also a few houses west of Yanceyville Street and the back portions of a few lots fronting on Lees Chapel Road.

E. AREA 2004-5 WEST OF YANCEYVILLE STREET AND NORTH OF URBAN LOOP THOROUGHFARE – 17.80 ACRES, 313 PEOPLE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said that Area 5 is likewise dominated by apartments, namely Phase 1 of Turnbridge Apartments at the southwest corner of Yanceyville Street and Peach Orchard Drive. Phase 2 of these apartments was annexed pursuant to a utility agreement and annexation petition. It was just an accident of history that Phase 1 was built before Council changed the policy, Phase 2 was built after Council changed the policy. In addition to this apartment development, this annexation includes Yanceyville Street itself such that when City vehicles are traveling out to this area and to some other areas that have already been annexed, they will be staying inside the city limits the whole way.

E. AREA 2004-6 EAST AND WEST OF NORTH CHURCH STREET BETWEEN OLD LAKE JEANETTE ROAD AND LAKE TOWNSEND – 267.58 ACRES, 931 PEOPLE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said Area 6, which is the largest of the areas in terms of population but not in terms of land area, is almost all residential. He pointed out where there is one landscaping business, but other than that, it is all residential. He pointed out the subdivisions of Granville Estates, Lake Jeanette East Park and Lakeshore Village. The latter two have City water and sewer.

He said staff had received quite a few questions as to why they did not annex an area west of N. Church Street south of the lake. There are no existing Greensboro sewer lines in the direction to which this lightly developed left-out area drains and that is one reason why it is not included.

G. AREA 2004-7 ALONG SUMMIT AVENUE, BRYAN PARK ROAD, U.S. HIGHWAY 29N, RUDD STATION ROAD, CORPORATE PARK DRIVE, AND OTHER STREETS – 909.56 ACRES, 314 PEOPLE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said that Area 7 in terms of acreage is decidedly the largest of all the annexations. He pointed out previously annexed areas, again pursuant to the utility agreement and annexation petitions. Some are in the Summit Industrial Park and the Lake Herman Industrial Park. He also pointed out the closed North Carolina School for the Deaf, which was previously annexed, and a portion of the Reedy Fork Development. There were previous annexations on the east, west and north. The new line comes across west-to-east, using existing street rights-of-way or property lines to define the new annexation boundary, so as to include a business, leave out a big vacant tract, put in this house, leave out that big vacant tract, etc., working its way back to Highway 29, on the east. Right through the middle of the annexation is Summit Avenue. The better part of a year ago staff brought to the Board a string of one-house utility agreement and annexation petitions, largely up and down Summit Avenue, and recommended that rather than bring these in and have the solid waste folks trying to figure out which house to pick up and which house not to pick up, that staff delay and bring those in as part of the big annexation, which was already under discussion at that time. He also said that this is the one annexation area where the City has to put in some major water and sewer facilities; most notably the City will have to put in a lift station and a sewer outfall. The state law requires that you put in the major outfalls and the major water lines to serve an area within 2 years after the effective date of an annexation. With each of these annexations, the City already has all of those lines in place, with the exception of this area.

H. AREA 2004-8 ON BOTH SIDES OF HIGH POINT ROAD, MACKAY ROAD, AND SUTTONWOD DRIVE – 57.38 ACRES, 1 PERSON. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said this annexation focuses on the Adams Farm Shopping Center. The city limits already include everything in the Adams Farm development except for the Adams Farm Shopping Center. For some reason, when the developer initially did this development he petitioned to annex everything northwest of the railroad tracks, but did not petition to annex the shopping center site. The annexation also includes a metal recycling facility, Pinecroft-Sedgefield Volunteer Fire Department, a landscaping business, a pharmacy, Unfinished Furniture World, banks, shops, McDonald's, etc. This area is divided into two subareas, but qualifies entirely under the developed for urban purposes standards. There would be a contract with the volunteer fire department.

Mr. MacIntosh explained that when contracting with volunteer fire departments, the amount the City is to pay under the contract relates to the amount of revenue that the fire district will lose by virtue of the annexation.

L. AREA 2004-9 AT A CEMETERY WEST OF ATWATER DRIVE – 0.5 ACRES, 0 PEOPLE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh pointed out a small cemetery surrounded by Adams Farm on three sides and by a mobile home park on the other side. All the surrounding properties have petitioned to be annexed over the years and have been annexed.

J. AREA 2004-10, PORTIONS OF THE BACK YARDS OF 5304 THROUGH 5314 CAROLWOOD DRIVE – 0.44 ACRES, 0 PEOPLE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said this Area 10 is the portion of back yards of 6 house lots. Once, there was an undeveloped tract next to here that was petitioned to be annexed. When the developers designed their subdivision and encountered some lot configuration problems, they worked out a swap with the adjoining owner. But they did not come back and petition for the added part. Later on, the other owner, with a revised property boundary, brings his own annexation petition in and then that is approved. This leaves this little sliver that was never annexed. Therefore, this is just another clean-up annexation.

K. AREA 2004-11 SOUTH OF WEBSTER ROAD AND WEST OF S. ELM-EUGENE STREET – 5.98 ACRES, 6 PEOPLE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said Area 11 is the southern portion of a subdivision. In the early 1970s, the City did a city-initiated annexation out in this direction and ran the city limit line 200 feet south of Webster Road. The annexation law at that time said that if you annexed using a street to define your boundary, then you had to include property on both sides, but you could go no more than 200 feet past the street. Over the years annexation lines sliced through many pieces of property, leaving them partly in and partly out of the city limits, so the State legislature has changed the law to say that the cities shall follow street rights-of-way lines or property lines.

L. AREA 2004-12 AT 3721 S. ELM-EUGENE STREET – 1.09 ACRES, 6 PEOPLE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh pointed out that Area 12 is surrounded by the present city limits and qualifies by having over 2.3 persons per acre and on a couple of other standards as well.

Mr. MacIntosh stated that the annexation process involves Resolutions of Intent, which Council approved on each of these areas, and then moves on the preparation of reports, which you have before you. Those reports set out how the areas qualify for annexation, how the City will provide services, estimates of revenues and costs and also a statement of impact on the rural fire departments affected. The areas must meet a couple of other requirements in the state law. One is that at least 1/8 of the boundary has to be contiguous with the present city limits. With each of the areas shown above, you see a common theme in that they coincide by much more than 1/8 of their boundaries. The unifying theme is in filling in the gaps to the present city limits, some of which have been created by processing utility agreement and annexation petitions over the past 7 years. Upcoming in the process is a public informational meeting at The Depot on the evening of March 22nd, and there is a Council public hearing on April 5, which is a special Council meeting. On April 20th, Council is scheduled to vote on the annexation ordinances, with a projected effective date of June 30th. This is the perfect date because it brings the properties into the city for the entire upcoming fiscal year so you don't have to prorate taxes. All the capital acquisitions that will be needed for the annexation can be programmed in to go on line for the upcoming fiscal year.

Mr. Hall moved that, based upon the record presented by staff demonstrating that the requisite requirements for city-initiated annexations have been presented, the Board favorably recommend to Council the annexation of Areas 2004-1 through 2004-12, seconded by Mr. Rhodes. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Hall, Rhodes, Bryson, Pike, Koonce, Fox, Marks. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:**A. UPDATE ON REQUEST TO WITHDRAW PETITION TO AMEND THE GENERALIZED LAND USE MAP IN THE VICINITY OF BATTLEGROUND AVENUE AND OLD BATTLEGROUND ROAD. (WITHDRAWN)**

Mr. MacIntosh said the applicant requesting an amendment to the Generalized Future Land Use Map at the corner of Battleground and Old Battleground withdrew that application and also withdrew the request for rezoning. In conjunction with that in an accompanying letter, the applicant voiced support for the staff-proposed amendment that was presented to this Board last month, but which you could not take action on at that meeting (as explained by the Legal Department). Since the tentative agenda went out, there has been a further development in that Council took the staff-recommended amendment and has sent it back to this Board for further deliberation, which with the consent of the Board will be on the agenda for next month's meeting on April 21st.

B. UPDATE ON TWO AMENDMENTS TO THE GREENSBORO URBAN AREA THOROUGHFARE PLAN.

Mr. McKinney said in addition to his role as Transportation Planner for the City, he was also present as a representative of the Greensboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Recently the Transportation Advisory Committee for the MPO adopted two resolutions amending the current Greensboro Urban Area Thoroughfare Plan.

The first one was what is called the Pegg Road-Thatcher Road Connector. This changed the classification of Pegg and Thatcher Roads from a collector to minor thoroughfare. Along with that, the Thoroughfare Plan now shows a proposed grade separation with I-40. This amendment was fueled by a study done by NCDOT on some congestion mitigation projects to ease congestion on NC 68. Adding this to the Thoroughfare Plan was pretty much just a formality in order to help move this project along because at some point in time, even if we did not do this now, we would have to come back and do it.

The second item, Hornaday Road, involves the extension of the current Hornaday Road from its western end over the Urban Loop and turns and connects with Chimney Rock Road. The City's Engineering Division has analyzed this project. They held public meeting/meetings last year on this project. Some very tight coordination with NCDOT is involved. NCDOT was under the assumption that Hornaday Road was currently on our Thoroughfare Plan prior to February. At a recent meeting, it was brought to their attention that it was not. They then requested that the City process an amendment to our Thoroughfare Plan adding Hornaday Road back on (prior to 1996 Hornaday Road was on the Thoroughfare Plan).

Mr. McKinney said the action now needed was for both these amendments to go before the North Carolina Board of Transportation for final adoption, but for local purposes, these amendments are now enforceable, as far as the Thoroughfare Plan and looking at building setbacks, etc. With Hornaday Road, the emphasis of getting this back onto the Thoroughfare Plan is that there needs to be some tight coordination with NCDOT because this involves building a rather lengthy bridge over the Urban Loop and what needs to happen is for that bridge to be built before that section of the Loop opens to traffic. Their projection for its opening to traffic is in July of 2007.

In response to a question from Chair Downs, Mr. McKinney said the process for these amendments locally is done. When the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) adopted these amendments that made them effective locally. The Transportation Advisory Committee is the policy-making Board of the MPO. On the Board sits the local area's representative, Doug Galyon; Sandy Carmany from the City Council is the chair; also on the Board are Mayor Holliday, Councilman Perkins and Councilman Vaughan. Jim Westmoreland, Director of Transportation, sits on the TAC as well and there are two County Commission representatives on the Committee, Bob Landreth and Mary Rakestraw.

Mr. McKinney said before they presented this to the TAC, they had this out for public comment. They advertised in the newspaper and distributed information out by e-mail to a very extensive list that they have in their office. From that, they received approximately 6 positive comments, and there was 1 negative comment from a resident in the area.

In response to a question from Mr. McIntyre, Mr. McKinney said that Volvo Truck, to his knowledge, had no direct contact. As to the property owners in that area, unless they were on the City's distribution list at that time, he could not confirm for them right now. Typically what is going to happen after this is that a feasibility study will determine whether or not the grade separation is feasible to construct. After that, the general public will have opportunities to provide input into the planning process.

In response to a question from Mr. Koonce, Mr. McKinney said the negative comment received back from the e-mails was from a resident who lives in Charlestowne Village. He was more concerned about noise from the Urban Loop and was thinking that wherever improvements are done at Hornaday Road, then additional mitigation measures would be put in place with the Loop construction. He said he informed this resident that, as far as noise impact from the Urban Loop, the resident needs to take that concern directly to NCDOT. That resident also expressed concerns about additional traffic that might be in the area. His concerns were valid, but having to weigh those over the entire area or network that they have to look at, the benefits that this roadway would provide greatly outweigh the concerns that the resident expressed.

Mr. Hall said he thought Mr. McIntyre had a very good question regarding Volvo. He said he did not know exactly what the processes are, but he said he thought the City needs to have as friendly an attitude as possible towards corporations doing business here. Volvo has gone to some length to try to screen their test area, probably not wanting competitors to be able to perch and see what they are doing. He said he thought it would be a very good idea if someone from staff talked with Volvo, because if this is something that could materialize, they may need to have a good bit of advance warning about how they might be able to screen that area of their property. You just don't grow trees and other perennial screenings, evergreens, overnight to build a buffer so someone can't sit up

there and take pictures. He said he thought that was a very good comment that Mr. McIntyre made and regardless of what the normal processes are, he thought the City needs to let these people know that there is some discussion out here so that if they are impacted, they can take that into consideration and be involved early on in the process. He said he could certainly see anyone who has been out in that area knows that that intersection of 40 and 68 has become a huge nightmare, many times waiting through the light cycles to go north and south at the various times of the day. There is a loop road just up to the north that is anticipated to take some traffic off of 68, connecting from the airport back over towards Kernersville. He thought all of these things were very important.

Mr. McKinney said that the map he had just handed out to the Board was also available on the City's website, although buried deep in the Transportation section.

Mr. Hall said it was dotted on the map as being proposed, but he thought he had read something about there being some funding from DOT allocated now for the portion of 68 above the airport. He asked if that was Pleasant Ridge Road?

Mr. McKinney said that was the 68-220 connector for the future I-73 route. As to its position in the budget, he said there had been some advancement, but there had also been some delay. The new connector over to 220 and the widening of 220 from that point north up to where 68 ties into 220 in Rockingham County. It was broken into 2 sections. They attempted earlier this year to let a project for the widening of existing 220 from that point just beside the Haw River up into Rockingham County, but they were unable to achieve all the permits needed from Federal agencies. One of the sticking points was that the southern terminus of the project just south of the Haw River was deemed to be an illogical terminus for the project. To his understanding, what has happened is that has sort of fueled advancement of the connector. He spoke with the Project Engineer for the connector portion last month and he had just issued a work order to have the land surveys done for that project, so things are starting to progress with it.

Mr. Fox said he was curious because he assumed that Thatcher and Hornaday are both just 2-lane?

Mr. McKinney said the preliminary engineering design for Hornaday Road is a 3-lane, 40-foot-wide street. The concept for Pegg-Thatcher is for that roadway is to be 4-lane divided. What you do not have in front of you on the map is the High Point Urban Area Thoroughfare Plan. On their Thoroughfare Plan, they show Pegg Road continuing south of Gallimore Dairy Road to tie into the northern extension of Penny Road, with the minor thoroughfare designation continuing down Penny Road all the way to its southern terminus, which he thought was High Point Road.

As to the extension of Bridford Parkway, Mr. McKinney said the roadway portion has the engineering design for it - just the roadway, not the bridge - about 90 percent complete. The purpose of the meeting they had recently with NCDOT was to work out how to get the bridge built and how to get it funded. Before they can do anything, even to do an estimate on the cost of the bridge, the Hornaday item needs to get back on the Thoroughfare Plan. The City is trying to get that Hornaday bridge under construction and have a majority of it done before the Urban Loop opens in July 2007.

Mr. McKinney said he would like to inform the Board that as a result of the Lowdermilk Street hearing at last month's meeting, they are going to pursue many of the requests and recommendations from this Board. Hopefully by the end of this week, he will have scheduled another public hearing in the neighborhood, and he asked to speak with Mr. Rhodes after the

meeting today to discuss that hearing. He said they would be coming back in April with most if not all the information the Board requested.

Chair Downs thanked Mr. McKinney for the fine update. He said he thought the additional work by Mr. McKinney and the subsequent presentation will help bring the Board's comfort level up with Mr. McKinney's recommendations and certainly will help them better debate amongst the Board members when they take that important neighborhood action.

C. SPECIAL MEETING FOR MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL, ZONING COMMISSION, PLANNING BOARD AND 2025 MONITORING COMMITTEE AT 4:00 P.M., MARCH 29 IN THE NUSSBAUM ROOM AT THE CENTRAL LIBRARY FOR THE PURPOSE OF REVIEWING INFORMATION FROM STAFF AND DISCUSSING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. (MEETING CALLED)

Mr. Morgan said this item was a request from the City Council that the Planning Board and the Zoning Commission and the Monitoring Committee, now adding the Steering Committee of the Comprehensive Plan, meet Monday, March 29 in the Nussbaum Room at the Central Library for the purpose of discussing the Comprehensive Plan. Basically it will be a discussion among the four groups, and staff would like to ask the Board to set that meeting just to be sure they have everything covered from a public meeting law standpoint. He said Council had thought the meeting would probably last from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., but did not want to say exactly at 6:00 p.m. if the conversation were going well, but he thought the primary idea was from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Chair Downs said he had had conversations with several of the Board members here about the process and he was sure that City staff would be looking at that. There was a little consternation in front of this Board as to the sequence followed on the Battleground Avenue plan amendment.

Mr. Morgan said, as staff had stated, they were trying to accommodate the applicant, which called for an illogical process. He wanted to clarify that the applicant's decision to withdraw was not based upon any conversations with the Planning Department. That was done on their own decision-making process. He did not want anybody walking away from this meeting to have any different idea.

Chair Downs thanked Mr. Morgan for that clarification.

Mr. Fox moved that the Planning Board meet in special session on Monday, March 29, 2004 at 4:00 p.m., at the Nussbaum Room in the Central Library, to be a joint meeting with the City Council, the Zoning Commission, the 2025 Monitoring Committee and the 2025 Steering Committee, seconded by Mr. Hall. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Hall, Rhodes, Pike, Koonce, Fox, Marks. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE CHAIRMAN:

Chair Downs said Mr. Rhodes had an item here about a Guilford County National Pan-Atlantic Council. It is a guild art exhibit and auction. It looked very interesting and so the members could see Mr. Rhodes about that.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Rhodes said he had another item he wanted to bring up after he received his packet and he read through it. He was a little confused about the Board's decision on Lowdermilk Street. He did not recall the motion to table this item to our next meeting.

Chair Downs said he did not recall a motion that the Board tabled this item from their last meeting, moving it forward. He did recall a question as to whether or not it was necessary to vote on that issue.

Mr. McIntyre said he thought the effect of it was that it was tabled because the Board was asking for additional information.

Chair Downs said on the termination of Lowdermilk Street access across the tracks, the Board had asked staff to go back to the drawing board, go to the community, prepare a detailed analysis of the recommendations and then come back.

Mr. McIntyre said the Board wanted the same level of analysis that they would have expected from a street closing so that it would facilitate their debate here.

Chair Downs said it was his understanding that it would come back before the Board at its April meeting. Transportation staff is going to hold another community meeting and Mr. McKinney had asked earlier today for Mr. Rhodes' input on that community meeting.

Mr. McIntyre called the Board's attention to Sue Schwartz's candidacy for American Institute of Certified Planners office and asked that they give her their support.

SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR ON ITEMS UNDER PLANNING BOARD AUTHORITY:

None.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

Mr. Hall moved approval of the absence of Mr. Bryson, seconded by Mr. Fox. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Hall, Rhodes, Pike, Koonce, Fox, Marks. Nays: None.)

* * * * *

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Morgan
Acting Planning Director

RM/jd.ps